



Mr Stephen Long  
4 Canada Rd  
Arundel  
BN18 9HY

Mr D Sullivan  
Arun District Council  
Maltravers Rd  
Littlehampton  
BN17 5LF

25<sup>th</sup> October 2014

Dear Mr Sullivan,

**RE: Planning Application AB/115/14/OUT**

I am writing to object to the outline application for 2 semi-detached houses to be built in the front gardens of 12 and 14 Canada Road, Arundel. As an immediate neighbour I am very concerned that the proposed development will have a serious impact on the standard of living for owners of the adjoining properties.

My specific objections are:

1. Detrimental impact upon residential amenities

Local Plan, Policy GEN7 - (ii) demonstrates that it responds positively to the identified characteristics and resources of the site and the area to create attractive places and spaces with the needs of people in mind and respects and enhances local distinctiveness;

Local Plan, Policy GEN7 - (iv) does not have an unacceptable adverse impact on adjoining occupiers, land, uses or property and, where relevant, facilitates the development of adjoining sites;

Local Plan, Policy GEN7 - (v) takes account of any unacceptable adverse impacts that may arise from adjoining land uses or property;

Local Plan, Policy GEN7 - (viii) provides for vehicle parking in accordance with Policy GEN12 and Appendix 2 and open space in accordance with Policy GEN20.

I believe that the proposed development is a direct contravention of these policies. Due to the unique layout of this part of Canada Road, the proposed development will significantly impact the surrounding neighbours and their enjoyment of their property, particularly in terms of:

- Overlooking windows (even with the mitigations listed in the application).
- Loss of open plan leading to an increased sense of enclosure due to the size, orientation and position of the proposed development in relation to existing properties.
- Loss of light.
- More noise and disturbance.

The proposal would result in an unduly cramped form of development which would be detrimental to the character and amenities of the surrounding residential area. The area has always been open plan to the front of the properties and this proposal would not fit in with the original development.

The properties 10 to 16 Canada Road are characterised by long front gardens sweeping down to the footpath. Properties 2 to 8 face onto these front gardens. The proposed development would destroy the open plan and leave the existing properties facing back gardens.

On the plan, the proposed houses appear larger in plan than the existing houses. In particular, the width of the building would seem to be significantly wider and this design would be out of keeping with the surrounding properties.

In addition, this development would set a precedent and would put pressure on the planning department to approve similar applications in the area, in particular for the same layout arrangement further up Canada Road.

## **2. Non-compliance with Government/Arundel guidance**

**The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 - 53. Local planning authorities should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area.**

**Arundel Neighbourhood Plan 2014 - 2029 The Neighbourhood Plan allocates the following sites for housing development, as shown on the Proposals Map: i. Land at River Road to be delivered in the period 2014-2019; ii. The Former Castle Stables, Arundel Castle, to be delivered in the period 2014-19.**

The proposed development is not within the two sites listed in the Arundel Neighbourhood Plan as suitable for housing development.

In addition, the Arundel Neighbourhood Plan is consistent with the policies and intent of the NPPF 2012. The applicants Design and Access/Planning Statement seems to imply that the proposed development will meet the requirement to make more efficient use of urban land and thus relieving pressure on Greenfield sites. It is difficult to see how the proposed development meets this requirement (and also the intent of the NPPF 2012) as it is in residential front gardens and will cause harm to the local area for the reasons outlined under point 1.

## **3. Slope of the Land**

**Local Plan, Policy GEN7 - (iv) does not have an unacceptable adverse impact on adjoining occupiers, land, uses or property and, where relevant, facilitates the development of adjoining sites;**

The Design and Access/Planning Statement states that the proposed development will "utilise the slope of the site, sloping down towards Canada Road, so as not to create an oppressive feature to the neighbouring properties".

I believe this statement fails to take into account that neighbouring properties No 2 and No 4 actually sit lower than the proposed development (see Photo 1) and they will therefore not benefit.

The angle of the slope does not appear to offer enough reduction in height to reduce the impact of the proposed development and the new houses and the existing properties 6 to 16 will still overlook each other (see photo 2).

#### 4. Inadequate parking and access

**POLICY GEN12** - The Local Planning Authority will base its consideration of the need for on-site parking provision on its parking standards contained within this Plan.

**Single House & Estate Development:** For each dwelling of 1, 2 or 3 bedrooms and providing that dwelling does not exceed 120 sq.m. gross floor area (excluding integral garage):- 1 GARAGE OR CAR SPACE and 1 SPACE FOR VISITORS to be provided in curtilage where possible and, in any case, be in a convenient position which will encourage use.

In considering the extent of reduced on-site parking provision, the Council will have regard to environmental and highway safety issues, together with the following factors: - (i) the availability, type and proximity of public parking; (ii) The availability of alternative means of transport;

According to the parking guidelines set out in GEN 12, a three bedroom house of the size proposed in the application is required to have parking space for a minimum of 2 cars where possible and this proposed development does not provide sufficient parking space to meet these requirements.

The applicant argues that the proposed development does not require a provision of 4 parking spaces as there is sufficient off road parking but I believe that this argument is seriously flawed.

I note that the statement uses the standard 2.4m x 4.8m bay dimensions to calculate the theoretic number of parking spaces. As there are no marked parking bays, in practice, the actual number of available "spaces" is far less. Also the applicant only provides parking data for two periods in the summer holidays which is not representative. There is already intense on-street parking pressure on the section of Canada Road mentioned in the application, especially after 17.30 and at weekends as photos 3 and 4 clearly show. Residents also resist parking alongside number 2 as this area is dark and secluded at night as photo 5 shows.

The off road area the applicant is referring is no better as it is not permanent.

The area to the left (looking towards the park from the proposed development) is part of the local park and is a mixture of gravel and mud. It is not maintained by the local authority and consequently between the road and gravel in the centre section, there is a substantial drop that causes damage to vehicle front and rear valances of unsuspecting motorists trying to park and there is an exposed manhole cover (see photos 6 and 7 ). In addition, in the autumn and winter months, approximately 50% of the area is virtually unusable to any vehicle other than 4x4's due to the muddy conditions. Already this area is starting to degrade as photo 8 shows and the condition will get significantly worst during the winter months.

The area to the right (looking towards the park from the proposed development) is also part of the local park and is a grassed area. In the Autumn and Winter months, nearly 100% of the area would quickly become virtually unusable to any vehicle other than 4x4's.

In a comprehensive community survey undertaken in November 2012, the most commonly identified mechanism for getting around outside of the town were by car (89%), the bus (24%) and walking (22%). It is therefore highly likely that anyone moving into these properties will require their own transport in-order to commute to work. Currently 4 properties surrounding the proposed development have 2 or more cars per household.

#### 5. Ground stability

**The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 – 121. Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that the site is suitable for its new use taking account of ground conditions and land instability, including from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, pollution arising from previous uses and any proposals for mitigation including land remediation or impacts on the natural environment arising from that remediation;**

I have serious concerns about the impact the proposed works could have on the stability of the neighbouring properties. The land slopes down towards Canada Road and there are no retaining walls. Subsidence is already a concern in the area due to natural springs. There has been subsidence at the top of Canada Road resulting in the need to underpin a number of houses.

Due to the age of the existing properties (circa 1948) I also have concerns about the impact of the proposed development on surrounding infrastructure including water, drainage and gas pipes.

#### 6. Public rights of way and access.

**The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 – 75. Planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access.**

The paths in the centre and to both sides of the proposed development are not listed as Public Right of Way on the Definitive Plan at Chichester County Hall, however there is uncertainty as to what access rights the residents have.

When the residents at number 8 requested disabled access for their property, there was some confusion by the Councils as to who owns the paths. If the path in the centre is owned jointly by the residents of 12 and 14, then it would follow that the alternative paths they intend to use when the path is removed would belong to other properties and they would not have an automatic right of access to enter their property via the other paths.

I am concerned that the proposed development removes the centre path and makes no provision for access to number 12 and 14 should the residents of number 10 and 16 block the path between the respective houses. This could lead to unwelcomed disputes in the future unless access rights are firmly established as part of this application.

#### 7. Wildlife

##### **Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981**

The application states that the proposed development is laid to lawn. This is not correct as 50% of the site (the front garden of number 12) is heavily planted and includes an established tree as photo 9 shows. The garden is poorly maintained and is highly likely to contain wildlife. Slow worms are

common in this area and are included in Schedule 5 of the Act. There have been slow worms sited in our garden and in the garden of 16 Canada Road. This is not addressed in the Biodiversity Checklist submitted by the applicant and I see no evidence that any assessment has been made in order to determine whether such wildlife will be affected by this development.

#### 8. Conclusion

In conclusion, I believe this pre planning application does not meet local or national planning policies and should therefore be rejected. I would be grateful if you would take my objections into consideration when deciding this application. My neighbours and I would welcome the opportunity to meet with a representative of the planning department at our homes to illustrate our objections at first hand.

Yours sincerely



Stephen Long



(Electronic version available upon request)

9. Photos



Photo 1: Looking up towards the development from the path at Number 2



Photo 2: Looking down on the development From bedroom of Number 16



Photo 3: Street parking along proposed development at 16.47 on 19<sup>th</sup> October 2014



Photo 4: Street parking along proposed development at 14.53 on 19<sup>th</sup> October 2014



Photo 5: Street parking alongside 2 Canada Road at 20.11 on 24th October 2014



Photo 6: The drop into the off road parking area 19th October 2014



Photo 7: Exposed manhole cover in the off road parking area 19th October 2014



Photo 8: Condition of the off road parking area 17th October 2014



Photo 9: Front garden of number 12